

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending.

Objections To The Drawings.

The formal drawings that accompany this Response correct the deficiencies noted in the Notice Of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review. The flow chart of original Figure 5 was too lengthy to fit on one sheet when properly formatted. Consequently, original Figure 5 has been broken down into Figures 5A and 5B and a legend added to Figure 5 with this notation.

Rejection Under Section 112.

Claim 7 was rejected under Section 112 as being indefinite. The Examiner states that the "Claim does not clarify what type of information is kept in memory."

Claim 5 recites a user input "to print each of said plurality of image files at a certain size." Claim 7 depends from Claim 5 and recites that "said user input [from Claim 5] is obtained from a file in said memory card." The "type of information" obtained from a file in the memory card is user input to print each of said plurality of image files at a certain size. Hence, there does not appear to be anything indefinite about any of the limitations in Claim 7 and Applicant requests that the Section 112 rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under Section 102 -- Reed Does Not Teach Printing A Sheet Of Thumbnail Images All With The Same Orientation In Response To A User Input.

Claims 1-24 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Reed. The rejection of all claims is based on the Examiner's assertion that Reed teaches a processor "responsive to another user input for specifying at least one arrangement of said plurality of image files wherein said image files are printed with a same orientation." This assertion is not correct.

Claim 1 recites a processor means

(1) responsive to a first user input to print a sheet with reduced versions of said plurality of image files in a first sequence of the image files, and

(2) responsive to another user input for specifying at least one arrangement of said plurality of image files wherein said image files are printed with a same orientation on said sheet.

"Said sheet" in item (2) refers to the sheet on which reduced versions are printed. So, Claim 1 requires a processor responsive to a user input to print a sheet of reduced version images (e.g., thumbnails) all with the same orientation. Reed does not teach or even suggest these limitations -- the passages in Reed cited by the Examiner do not support the rejection.

The Examiner cites to Reed, column 7, lines 19-52, as teaching these limitations (as well as the added limitation in Claim 2). These passages from Reed are set forth verbatim below.

"The 'index' button 44 preferably prints a set or collection of thumbnail [sic] of the images (i.e., images of substantially reduced size), wherein each thumbnail image is associated with one of the graphic files (e.g., 102, 106, 108, 110) stored on a computer readable medium disposed in any one of the first drive 32, the second drive 34, or the third drive 56, as described in block 128. This set of thumbnail images can be printed on one or more of the sheets 24 depending upon the number of thumbnail images. Adjacent each thumbnail image is preferably printed its associated photo number (e.g., N=1, 2, 3, 4, etc.). This feature facilitates easy use of the printer 20, because it allows a user of the printer 20 to quickly determine which image is associated with a particular photo number independent of the digital device which recorded the image. Images can then be easily identified and selected for printing by merely designating the appropriate photo number. Activation of the 'print all' button 48 initiates printing of a snapshot sized (e.g., 4 inches x 6 inches) image for each graphic file stored on the computer readable medium disposed in the active drive, as shown in block 130. The 'select' button 42 and 'print' button 46 are used to select and print specific images with user selected formatting, respectively, as described in blocks 132 and 134.

As illustrated in block 126, a user of the printer 20 can also select any one of a number of submenus using the menu routine 70 to format and print the images associated with the graphic file disposed in the active drive. For instance, the print submenu described in block 138 can provide selectable options for the size of the sheet 24 on which the images are to be printed (e.g., A4, A6, 8.5 inches x 11 inches, 4 inches x 6 inches, etc.), the number of images per sheet from a preselectable group (e.g., 1, 2, 4, 6 etc.), the number of copies to be printed, the type of sheets 24 which will be used (e.g., plain paper, coated paper, photopaper, etc.), the quality of the printing, etc." Reed, column 7, lines 18-52.

Conspicuously absent from these passages in Reed is any mention of the orientation of the thumbnail images generally, and more specifically, a processor responsive to a user input for specifying an arrangement in which thumbnail images are printed with the same orientation. If the Examiner disagrees, he is respectfully requested to specifically point out and explain the language in Reed that supports his assertion. Absent such a showing, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 depends from Claim 1 and recites the added limitation that "wherein said at least one arrangement comprises an alternate arrangement wherein said image files are arranged to fit as many image files as possible on said sheet." Again, there is nothing in Reed that teaches or suggests a user input specifying arranging thumbnail images to fit as many as possible on a sheet. If the Examiner disagrees, he is respectfully requested to specifically point out and explain the language in Reed that supports his assertion.

For these same reasons, Claims 9-10 and 17-18 are also felt to distinguish patentably over Reed. Claims 2-8, 10-16 and 18-24 distinguish patentably over Reed due to their dependence from Claims 1, 9 and 17, respectively.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding office action.

Respectfully submitted,



Steven R. Ormiston
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,974
208.433.1991 x204